

readily understood by any one skilled in the art to which this invention pertains. As another example of the term "IP", attention is directed to U.S. Patent 4,940,503 issued in July 1990, which also defines the term "IP"; See column 4, lines 58-64. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-4 and 6-13 as presented for examination comply fully with the requirements of 35 USC 112, 2nd paragraph and, accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munk et al (U.S. Patent 4,594,347) is respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

Although it is alleged that Munk et al disclose a method of hot pressing a "synthetic-resin laminate," the Examiner does recognize and concedes that Munk et al "do not explicitly disclose that the laminate has an IP value in the range claimed." This is because Munk et al does not disclose the use of a laminate having hard particles therein, thereby imparting to the laminate an IP value in excess of 3000 revolutions. There is no way that Munk et al's lamination of a mass of fibers in a thermosetting binder to form a preform body which is then hot pressed to convert the preformed body to an intermediate body upon which a skin is placed (and a degassed intermediate body and skin are subsequently hot pressed to form the final integrated body) would teach, in any way, the steps of the claimed process. In the claimed process, applicants use a thin decorative thermosetting laminate of post-forming quality which is glued to a carrier wherein the laminate itself has high abrasion resistance, i.e. greater than 3000 revolutions. The standard for abrasion resistance are set forth in the body of the specification (See the first full paragraph on page 3 of the specification) and certainly would not be met by the Munk et al foils, one of which is a paper sheet with a desired pattern and the uppermost one which is an overlay consisting of a unsubstituted alpha-cellulose paper. Moreover, the claimed invention is not limited to forming the intermediate carrier to which a laminate has been glued

but rather includes the subsequent machining step of the laminate coated carrier to form one or more floor profiles which may be the same or different cross-section. This is clearly not a process step suggested or taught by Munk et al and is clearly more than merely an "intended use" as the Examiner has characterized the invention. Rather, the claimed invention recites specific processing steps, e.g. machining steps from a novel laminate coated carrier, to produce certain floor profiles selected from the group consisting of dilation profile, transition profile and finishing profile which are nowhere suggested by Munk et al. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that Munk et al fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for the claimed invention and therefore, withdrawal of the rejection and passage of the application to issue are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP:mat
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 30422

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1400 K Street, N.W., Suite 1010
Washington, D.C. 20005-2477
Telephone: (202) 408-5100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: April 8, 1998